

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 40-44 are allowed and that claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 28 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has added new claim 46 which includes some of the subject matter indicated to be allowable and as such, this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the suggestion to incorporate certain portions of the Specification into independent claims to expedite examination. However, Applicant respectfully submits that upon review of the newly cited reference, the independent claims are allowable as they currently stand.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20-25 and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,827 (Geist) in view of Schmeidler and further in view of Bisbee et al. This is a new ground of rejection. Geist is directed to a method and data file structure for embedding a digital signature verification key within a particular type of image data file to enable validation of the image data autonomously such as without consulting large external databases of public keys or certificates. Geist teaches a different system and method from that claimed by Applicant. For example, the Geist reference is directed to securing an image data file that identifies predetermined subsets of data residing in the data file and stores non-image data in preselected locations in the data file with the image data. (See cited section of column 2, lines 44-62). Applicant respectfully submits that it appears that the claims have been parsed in a manner inconsistent with the actual claim language in an attempt to render the claims

unpatentable. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the Geist reference and the combination of the other references do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

As to claims 1, 17, 20 and 29, for example, the claims require determining a digital signature verification error based on a received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier. The office action appears to parse the language of this step in claim 1 (and other claims) and the other step of claim 1 to disregard specific claim language. For example, as claimed, the determination of the digital signature verification error is based on a received message header identifier associated with a public key certificate identifier. In addition, a digital signature verification map as claimed is generated that contains a plurality of acceptable message header identifiers associated with the public key certificate identifier. As such, Applicant claims the determination of a digital signature verification error based on specified information and a generation of a digital signature verification map containing specified information, none of which is taught or suggested in the cited references. For example, the office action merely cites Geist as teaching a digital signature verification error determination by citing the Abstract, FIGs. 2 and 3, and column 2, lines 44-62 without taking into account the other claim language. In any event, Applicant respectfully submits that no digital signature verification error determination is described in the cited portions of Geist. Instead, the cited portions define a data structure used and taught by Geist to provide self authentication of a data structure such as an image. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing as to where the claimed subject matter is allegedly taught in the cited references.

In addition, the office action cites Geist as allegedly teaching the generation of the claimed digital signature verification map. However, the cited portion of Geist, namely column 4, lines 45-67; column 5 – column 6, line 38, and FIGs. 1-3, after being reviewed do not appear

to teach any such digital signature verification map as claimed. Instead for example, the cited portion of column 4 refers to directory entries and custom tags that are used for specifying an authentication index. In particular, such four private custom directory entries specify custom tags or pointers in the data structure. It also teaches excluding authenticatable data from an authentication index. Applicant is unable to find any generation of a digital signature verification map as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in condition for allowance. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing by column and line number of where the cited reference teaches the subject matter as alleged.

In addition, since the reference does not teach what is alleged the combination with the other references also does not teach the claimed subject matter and as such, the claim is in condition for allowance for at least this reason as well.


The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Geist in view of Schmeidler and Bisbee and further in view of Cooper for the reasons applied to claims 1, 10, 20 and 29. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/16/06

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P. C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005